100TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION SENATE DOCUMENT 100-29

MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS OF THE SENATE

History and Development of the Offices of the Floor Leaders

Prepared by
FLOYD M. RIDDICK, *Parliamentarian Emeritus*

MARCH 22, 1988.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1988

S920-3

SENATE RESOLUTION 398

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

March 22 (legislative day, March 21), 1988.

Resolved, That the compilation entitled "Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate", prepared by the Senate Parliamentarian Emeritus, Floyd M. Riddick, shall be printed, with any revisions and certain tables, as a Senate document, and an additional 2,000 copies shall be printed for distribution by the Secretary of the Senate.

Attest:

WALTER J. STEWART,

Secretary.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS OF THE SENATE

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE OFFICES OF THE FLOOR LEADERS

The "offices" of the majority and the minority leader, as we know them today, are of recent development in the history of the Senate although individual Senators since 1789 have assumed leading roles in the determination of what the Senate would or would not do. Some of these Senators, at one time or another, have stood high in the ranks of their respective political parties. The power or influence of some Senators, in various periods of our history, to guide or lead their respective parties, or even the Senate itself, in the determination of a legislative program, has been particularly noteworthy. Caucuses of Senators of a particular party, of a common interest, of a geographical area, or of some "blocs" have been called from time to time from the beginning of the first Senate for all kind of purposes, including the determination of the position to be taken on certain proposed legislation, or such things as to determine the names and sizes of committees. These meetings, however, were not invoked to perform as organized political caucuses for the purpose of selecting persons to serve as floor leaders for the parties during the sessions of the Senate until the latter part of the 19th century.

One writer on the Senate covering the period from 1869–1901 stated that after the Civil War "Senators were . . . easily identified as Republicans or Democrats, but . . . [the] party could not maintain significant control over the legislative process." [1] In pre-Civil War America he found that "No caucus or informal committee determined general political policies, or designed specific measures, or enforced discipline, or looked over desired legislation." [2]

---

[1] David J. Rothman, *Politics and Power: The United States Senate, 1869–1901*, Harvard University Press, 1966, p.13.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

It was not until the latter part of the 19th century that the Senators of each political party organized and assembled separately as a unit for the purpose of electing certain members from among their own to represent each, respectively, as agents in helping to run the legislative machine. According to the best available records, it was not until the 20th century that the posts of majority and minority leaders became official political positions.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to point to anyone who functioned as the "majority leader of the Senate" until the end of the 19th century. The conferences or caucuses had frequently served as an instrument of party leadership,[3] but "Senators in the 1870's usually performed their tasks without party superintendence. * * * Democratic and Republican organizations rarely attempted to schedule legislation or enforce unity in voting." [4]

Various Senators, at different times, have stood out as legislative leaders but they were not selected by organized political parties in that capacity. Historians cite numerous such Senators in different eras of the American Senate.

To illustrate by a few examples, note the following: Senator Maclay of Pennsylvania left a characteristic account of the proceedings of the Senate on the last day of the first Congress, March 3, 1791. He wrote, "It was patching, piecing, altering and amending, and even originating new business. It was, however, only for Ellsworth, King, or some of Hamilton's people to rise, and the thing was generally done * * *." [5]

Senator William Allen of Ohio, an opponent of Senator Henry Clay, once remarked on the Senate floor, "When that Senator [Clay] shakes his head and says, 'I hope not,' we know how the yeas and nays will stand as well as if they had been taken and counted." Clay, on another occasion, commented: "I do not like to be a dictator in any sense," to which Senator James Buchanan replied, "You do it so well, you ought to like it." [6]

Clay's leadership, however, was not that of the Senate alone. He was considered the "great leader of the Whig Party throughout the Union," [7] but it would be difficult to consider him as precursor of the modern majority leader of the Senate.

The biographer of Senator William Allison (first elected to the Senate in 1872) wrote: "after fourteen years in the Senate, Allison

---

[3] See *National Republican*, March 8, 1869, p. 1; *Washington Evening Star*, Dec. 2, 1873, p. 3; October 16, 1877, p. 1; October 17, 1877, p. 1.

[4] Rothman, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[5] *The Journal of William Maclay*, edited by Edgar S. Maclay, at 411, as quoted George H. Haynes in his work entitled *The Senate of the United States*, pp. 77–78.

[6] *Con. Globe*, 27th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 47–48.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 47–48.

was a recognized leader of that body," [8] but added that the Senate was dominated not by one Senator but by a collegial group including Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island, John Spooner of Wisconsin, Eugene Hale of Maine, Orville Platt of Connecticut, Joseph R. Hawley of Connecticut, and James McMillan of Michigan.[9]

In 1885 Woodrow Wilson wrote in his volume on *Congressional Government* that "No one is *the* Senator. No one may speak for his party as well as for himself * * *." [10]

It became clear by the beginning of the 20th century who the chairmen of the party caucuses were [11] but it was still not clear who the majority leader of the Senate was since neither party elected "leaders" as such.

Available minutes of the caucuses or conferences [12] of the Democrats and Republicans, which go back to 1903 and 1911, respectively, reveal that each party since those dates has elected one of its members to be chairman of its respective caucuses. For example, on December 8, 1905, the Democrats elected Senator Arthur P. Gorman to be chairman of their caucus. On June 9, 1906, Senator Joseph C. S. Blackburn of Kentucky was selected to that same position. The caucus then adopted the following resolution:

> The Democratic Senators in selecting as the chairman of this conference Senator Blackburn of Kentucky, congratulate themselves and their several constituencies upon the fact that they have among their number one so well fitted by his marked capacity, his great acquirements, and his large experience in Congressional work, and especially by his power as an orator and as a debator, to render to his party associates the most signal and valuable services as their chosen official leader in the great forum of the Senate of the United States.

While the language of this caucus resolution uses the phrase "official leader," Senator Blackburn was not chosen by the party to be its floor leader but rather to be its caucus chairman.

In these early years of the 20th century each of the parties selected its own chairman for its party conference or caucus, but no Senators were elected to be the majority or minority leader as we know these offices today. As a matter of fact, down into the 1930's it was common practice for the chairmen of the standing committees to

---

[8] Leland Sage, *William Boyd Allison*, p. 203.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 246–247.

[10] Woodrow Wilson, *Congressional Government*, p. 147.

[11] See *Washington Post*, November 11, 1903, p. 4, or December 6, 1905, p. 4, and December 3, 1907, p. 4.

[12] The Republican meetings were known as caucuses until January 28, 1913; while the Democrats have not adopted a resolution to change the name of their meetings in recent years, the term "Democratic Conference" has been commonly used.

move to proceed to the consideration of measures and then manage the proposed legislation reported by their respective committees. The center aisle seats until that date were not always occupied by the "leaders," nor were the "leaders" always spokesmen for their party on the floor—they were chairmen of the party meetings of their respective parties and they played an important role in the determination of legislation in that capacity.

The parties have varied over the years in the number of conferences or caucuses they held during a session. In recent years, however, both the Democrats and the Republicans have adopted a pattern of meeting on a frequent and regular basis, usually weekly. It was not until 1981, under the minority leadership of Senator Byrd, that the Democrats started this practice. The Republicans had established this procedure much earlier.

These meetings help to resolve such things as positions on pending proposed legislation and to assure how the members of a party would vote on issues. They have been called binding caucuses by some writers, particularly when a two-thirds vote was forthcoming in support of an issue. For example, the following resolution was adopted on February 3, 1906, at a meeting of the Democratic caucus:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate ought not to advise and consent to the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Santo Domingo now pending before the Senate; and be it further resolved that if two-thirds of this caucus shall vote in favor of the foregoing resolution, it shall be the duty of every Democratic Senator to vote against the ratification of said treaty.

On February 6, 1917, the Republican caucus considered a bill (S. 8109, introduced by Senator Miles Poindexter) and agreed "that Republican Senators should support" the bill. Again on April 18, 1922, the Republican caucus adopted the following resolution:

> That it is the sense of this conference that the Senate should, at this session, pass a soldiers bonus bill and that the Republican Members of the Finance Committee be requested to report such a bill within three weeks from date.[13]

---

[13] With respect to Senators of a caucus being bound by any action taken in caucus meetings, note the comments of Senator Fessenden to Senator Summer as quoted by George H. Haynes in his work entitled: *The Senate of the United States,* at p. 476, footnote 1:

FESSENDEN: 'You may not go into consultation—call it a caucus or what you will—where the implied obligation is that the question under consideration is to be settled by a majority, and not only debate but vote, and then, finding yourself in a minority, say, "I am not bound." '

Haynes also notes that various Senators vigorously opposed any idea of being bound by caucus action.

Gradually, while conferences and caucuses were regularly called to resolve positions of the party on proposed legislation, they were no longer used to bind the members of a party to vote a particular way. But the chairman of the caucus became a dominant figure in the party organization and began to evolve into the leader of the State.

In March 1913, after Democrats had regained the majority in the Senate following two decades in the minority, they elected John W. Kern of Indiana as caucus chairman. Although serving in his freshman term, Kern was a nationally prominent Democrat closely allied with President Wilson's progressive wing of the party. His party sought effective leadership to hold together their narrow majority and to enact Wilson's ambitious programs. Kern's floor leadership antedated many of the later functions of that post, causing newspapers to refer to him as "Majority Leader Kern", and "the Democratic floor leader in the Senate", even though he lacked any official party designation other than caucus chairman.

On January 15, 1920, a Democratic conference was called by its chairman for the announced purpose "of selecting a leader for the Democrats of the Senate." This was the first time that the caucus minutes showed that the meeting was being called to elect a "leader" for the party and not just a chairman of the party caucus. At the conference on May 21, 1920, it was stated for the first time that the meeting was "called to order by Senator Underwood, minority leader"; previously it had been stated by Senator ———, or chairman ———, of the Democratic conference.

At the meeting of March 5, 1921, the Democratic conference was called to elect officers of the party, "including the Democratic leader." Thus it had been fully established that the Democratic Party had created the office of party leader to serve as majority or minority leader of the Senate, depending upon whether it was the majority or minority party.

The story of the Republican conference was much the same. According to the minutes of its conference, from 1911 until 1925, the Republicans, just as the Democrats, had elected one of their members to be chairman of their conference. But on March 5, 1925, James E. Watson of Indiana nominated Senator Charles Curtis of Kansas to be chairman of the conference and floor leader—and he was unanimously elected. From this date until January 4, 1945, the same person was elected to serve both as chairman and floor leader.

On January 4, 1945, the Republican conference, acting under rules previously adopted on February 18, 1944, and amended on December 15, 1944, eliminated the positions of vice chairman and assistant floor leader and proceeded to elect the following officers:

Chairman of the conference
Floor leader

Secretary
Whip [14]

Under the then existing rules the six members of the steering committee were nominated by the chairman and confirmed by the Republican conference. Later that day the steering committee met and elected its chairman.

Thus not only were the Republican Party's officers of chairman of the conference and floor leader divided but also since that date the Republican Party in the Senate has divided its organization into the party positions previously listed. In addition, the Republican conference elects a chairman of its policy committee, and the conference chairman appoints a chairman of the Republican committee on committees, after consultation with the Republican floor leader.

In its original rules adopted by the Republican conference in 1944, the duties of party officers are outlined and in section 3 thereof there appears the following:

> The floor leader shall perform the customary duties of the majority or minority leader, as the case may be, on the floor of the Senate, and shall have full authority to deal with all questions of procedure after consulting the Republican Senators who are concerned.

There has been much change in the "image," activities, and "role" played by the majority and minority leaders since each party began to use the word "leader." This stems considerably from the differences in the personalities of the individual leaders as well as the needs of the party growing out of increased functions assumed by the Federal Government.

The term "floor leader" as applied to the party heads of the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate has been one of considerable confusion. Newspapers and magazines used the term before the turn of the century to label these party heads; and the term was commonly used before caucuses of the two parties began actually to elect "floor leaders," who were to serve in such capacity on the floor of the Senate. To sum up, however, the Democrats in conference voted in 1920 for the first time to elect "a leader," and this person has served since that date as ex-officio chairman of the Democratic conference. The Republicans first voted in 1925 to elect their leader, who also served as chairman of the Republican conference down until 1945. Since that date a different person has been elected for each office.[15]

---

[14] The title of the office "Whip" was changed to "Assistant Floor Leader" in conference on Oct. 7, 1969, but is currently frequently referred to as "Assistant Republican Leader".

[15] The tables are entitled "Caucus chairmen and floor leaders," in order to encompass all possible labels used by the two party caucuses and conferences for the periods that party minutes of the Democrats and Republicans are available since 1903 and 1911, respectively.

Unofficial sources of information disclose that at least since 1893 both parties meeting separately have been formally electing a Senator from their ranks to serve as chairman of their conference or caucus. Note the following table which gives the names of the Senators so elected by each party together with their years of service:

TABLE I.—*Caucus chairmen (floor leaders)*

From Unofficial Sources in the Period Predating the Caucus Minutes

[The name of the leader is in roman type when his party was in the majority and in italic type when his party was in the minority]

DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
Arthur P. Gorman (Md.) 1893–95	*John Sherman* (Ohio) 1893–95
Arthur P. Gorman (Md.) 1895–98	John Sherman (Ohio) 1895–97
	William B. Allison (Iowa) 1897
* * *	* * * * 1
John T. Morgan (Ala.) 1901–02	Eugene Hale (Maine) 1901–02
James K. Jones (Ark.) 1902–03	Orville Platt (Conn.) 1902–03
	George F. Hoar (Mass.) 1903
	Eugene Hale (Maine) 1903–04
	William B. Allison (Iowa) 1904–06
	Eugene Hale (Maine) 1906–07
	William B. Allison (Iowa) 1907–08
	Nelson W. Aldrich (R.I.) 1908–09
	Eugene Hale (Maine) 1909–10
	Shelby Cullom (Ill.) 1910–11

[1] Data missing for this period.

The following table, set up from information taken from the minutes of the caucuses or conferences of each party, gives a complete list since 1903 and 1911, respectively, first of the chairmen of the

conferences of each party and then the "leaders" of each party after each party began so designating them.

TABLE II.—*Caucus chairmen and floor leaders of the Senate as determined from the caucus minutes of the two major parties*

[The name of the leader is in roman type when his party was in the majority and in italic type when his party was in the minority]

DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
Arthur P. Gorman (Md.) Elected March 16, 1903 Died June 4, 1906	
Joseph C.S. Blackburn (Ky.) Elected June 9, 1906 Term ended March 3, 1907	
Charles A. Culberson (Texas) Elected Dec. 3, 1907	
Hernando D. Money (Miss.) Elected Dec. 9, 1909 Term ended March 3, 1911	
Thomas S. Martin (Va.) Elected April 7, 1911	Shelby M. Cullom (Ill.) Elected April 4, 1911
John W. Kern (Ind.) Elected March 5, 1913 Term ended March 3, 1917	*Jacob H. Gallinger* (N.H.) Elected March 5, 1913 Died Aug. 17, 1918
Thomas S. Martin (Va.) Elected March 6, 1917	*Henry Cabot Lodge* (Mass.) Elected Aug. 24, 1918
Thomas S. Martin (Va.) [1] Democrats in minority March 4, 1919 Died Nov. 12, 1919 [2]	Henry Cabot Lodge (Mass.) Republicans in majority March 4, 1919 Died Nov. 9, 1924
Oscar W. Underwood (Ala.) [3] Elected April 27, 1920	
Joseph T. Robinson (Ark.) Elected Dec. 3, 1923	Charles Curtis (Kans.) [3] Elected Nov. 28, 1924 Resigned March 3, 1929
	James E. Watson (Ind.) Elected March 5, 1929 Term ended March 3, 1933
Joseph T. Robinson (Ark.) Democrats in majority March 4, 1933 [4] Died July 14, 1937	*Charles L. McNary* (Ore.) Elected March 7, 1933 Died Feb. 25, 1944
Alben W. Barkley (Ky.) Elected July 22, 1937	*Wallace H. White, Jr.* (Maine) [5] Elected Jan. 4, 1945
Alben W. Barkley (Ky.) Democrats in minority Jan. 3, 1947 Resigned Jan. 19, 1949	Wallace H. White, Jr. (Maine) Republicans in majority Jan. 3, 1947 Term ended Jan. 3, 1949
Scott W. Lucas (Ill.) Elected Jan. 20, 1949 [6] Term ended Jan. 3, 1951	*Kenneth S. Wherry* (Neb.) Elected Jan. 3, 1949 Died Nov. 29, 1951

TABLE II.—*Caucus chairmen and floor leaders of the Senate as determined from the caucus minutes of the two major parties*—Continued

[The name of the leader is in roman type when his party was in the majority and in italic type when his party was in the minority]

DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
Ernest W. McFarland (Ariz.) Elected Jan. 2, 1951 Term ended Jan. 3, 1953	
Lyndon B. Johnson (Texas) Elected Jan. 2, 1953	
Lyndon B. Johnson (Texas) Democrats in majority Nov. 10, 1953 [7] Resigned Jan. 3, 1961	
	William F. Knowland (Calif.) Republicans in minority Nov. 10, 1953 Term ended Jan. 3, 1959
Mike Mansfield (Mont.) Elected Jan. 3, 1961 Term ended Jan. 3, 1977	
Robert C. Byrd (W. Va.) Elected Jan. 4, 1977 Re-elected Jan. 15, 1979	
Robert C. Byrd (W. Va.) Elected Jan. 5, 1981 [8] Re-elected Jan. 3, 1983 [9] Re-elected Jan. 3, 1985 [10]	
Robert C. Byrd (W. Va.) Elected Jan. 6, 1987 [11]	
	Styles Bridges (N.H.) Elected Jan. 8, 1952
	Robert A. Taft (Ohio) Elected Jan. 2, 1953 Died July 31, 1953
	William F. Knowland (Calif.) Elected Aug. 4, 1953
	Everett McKinley Dirksen (Ill.) Elected Jan. 7, 1959 Died Sept. 7, 1969
	Hugh Scott (Pa.) Elected Sept. 24, 1969 Term ended Jan. 3, 1977
	Howard H. Baker, Jr. (Tenn.) Elected Jan. 4, 1977 Re-elected Jan. 15, 1979
	Howard H. Baker, Jr. (Tenn.) Elected Jan. 5, 1981 [8] Re-elected Jan. 3, 1983 [9] Term ended Jan. 3, 1985
	Robert Dole (Kans.) Elected Jan. 3, 1985 [10]
	Robert Dole (Kans.) Elected Jan. 6, 1987 [11]

[1] The Democrats met in caucus on May 17, 1919, to re-elect Senator Martin as their leader for the 66th Congress, they having become the minority party on March 4, 1919, the date the term of office commenced for the newly elected Senators for that Congress.

[2] Senator Hitchcock served as acting leader for a while until Underwood was elected on April 27, 1920; when the caucus first met to elect a leader following the death of Martin, the vote was a tie between Hitchcock and Underwood.

[3] These were the first men actually to be called "floor leaders" in the caucus minutes.

[4] The Democratic caucus actually met on March 6, 1933, to elect Senator Robinson as their leader with the Democrats coming into the majority on March 4, 1933.

[5] In 1940 at the request of Senator McNary, Senator Austin served as acting leader and in succeeding years until he became leader, Senator White served as acting leader.

[6] The Democratic caucus met on December 31, 1948, to elect senator Scott Lucas as their leader, upon resignation of Senator Barkley, January 19, 1949.

[7] With the death of Robert Taft of Ohio and his replacement by Thomas Burke on November 10, 1953, the division was 48 Democrats, 47 Republicans and 1 Independ-

ent. William F. Knowland remained majority leader, however, until the commencement of the 84th Congress in 1955. (See 83 *Con. Rec.* 2217, Feb. 24, 1954.)

[8] The Republican conference met on Dec. 2 1980, and elected Senator Baker to be their leader for the 97th Congress, to be convened on Jan. 5, 1981; the Democrats met on Dec. 4, 1980, and selected Senator Robert C. Byrd as their leader for the 97th Congress.

[9] Both the Republicans and the Democrats met on Dec. 5, 1982, and re-elected Senators Baker and Byrd as their respective leaders for the 98th Congress, to convene on Jan. 3, 1983.

[10] The Republican conference met on Nov. 28, 1984, and elected Senator Dole to be their leader for the 99th Congress, to be convened on Jan. 3, 1985; the Democrats met on Dec. 12, 1984, and re-elected Senator Byrd as their leader for the 99th Congress.

[11] The Democratic caucus met on Nov. 20, 1986, and re-elected Senator Robert C. Byrd to be their leader for the 100th Congress, to convene on Jan. 6, 1987; the Republican Conference met on Nov. 20, 1986, and selected Senator Robert Dole as their leader for the 100th Congress.

As spokesmen for their party in the Senate, some of the above chairmen and leaders have performed more actively than others. In more recent years they have assumed larger roles in behalf of their respective parties in the determination of legislation and in the procedures of the Senate to the enactment of legislation.

It should be pointed out here that as of August 15, 1974, the Senator from Montana, Mr. Mansfield, had served in the capacity not only as majority, but also as party leader longer than any other Senator in the history of the Senate. However, in 1985, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, the present majority leader of the Senate, acquired the rank of having served in an official party leadership role longer than any other Senator. His leadership role for the Democratic Party in the Senate already spans two decades. Senator Byrd is the only Senator to have held the positions of party secretary, whip, minority leader, and majority leader; and he is the first to have served as majority leader, then minority leader and to have been re-elected to the position of majority leader when his party regained control in the Senate.[16]

APPRENTICESHIP ROLE OF LEADERS

The table below sets forth the names of the "leaders" of each party since 1911, and the number of years each of them served as Senator before acquiring the distinction of holding the leadership post together with the number of years of service of each as leaders. The average number of years of service in the Senate of the floor leaders before being elevated to that post, as set forth in table III,

[16] Senator Byrd attained his first leadership post as secretary of the Democratic Conference in January of 1967; he was elected assistant majority leader, also known as majority whip, in January, 1971; and subsequently he was elected majority leader in January of 1977. With the Democrats in the minority he was selected to be the minority leader in January of 1981, which post he held until January 6, 1987, when the Democrats returned to the majority party and Senator Byrd was again elected majority leader.

has been approximately 12, which can be determined by the figures given below:

TABLE III.—*Seniority of majority and minority leaders of the Senate (1911–1988)*

Democrats	Years of service in Senate		Republicans	Years of service in Senate	
	Before becoming leader	As leader		Before becoming leader	As leader
Byrd of W.Va.....	18	(1)	Dole	16	(2)
Mansfield.....	8	16	Baker	10	8
Johnson	4	8	Scott	10	7
McFarland	10	2	Dirksen	8	10
Lucas	10	2	Knowland	9	5
Barkley.....	10	11	Taft.....	14	1
Robinson	10	14	Bridges	15	1
Underwood.....	5	3	Wherry.....	6	2
Kern.....	2	4	White	13	3
Martin [3]	16	5	McNary	15	11
			Watson	13	4
			Curtis.....	10	4
			Lodge	26	5
			Gallinger.....	22	5
			Cullom.....	17	2

[1] Since 1977. [2] Since 1985. [3] Broken terms.

By and large, the Senators who have become leaders of their party had rather active roles in the Senate before moving up to that position. Of the 25 leaders listed in table III, 14 held the chairmanship of a standing committee before their respective party conferences voted to elect them as their party leader. One Senator—Lodge of Massachusetts—had previously been chairman of four, and was chairman of one other during his leadership. Ten of the twenty-five leaders were chairmen of committees while serving simultaneously as leader of their party, but a number of the others decided not to continue their committee chairmanships after having been elected leader.

Of the last four Democratic and five Republican majority and minority leaders, only one served as a standing committee chairman prior to election as leader. Of these nine Senators, only three held a standing committee chairmanship at all: Lyndon Johnson (Chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, 1958–1961), Mike Mansfield (Chairman of the Rules and Administration Commit-

tee, 1961–1963), and Robert Dole (Chairman of the Finance Committee, 1981–1985).

A checklist of the prior, concurrent, or subsequent service as standing committee chairmen of the 25 Senate majority or minority leaders is set forth below.

TABLE IV.—*Senate majority or minority leaders with prior, concurrent, or subsequent service as standing committee chairmen* [1]

Majority or minority leader	Tenure as leader	Service as committee chairman		
		Prior	Concurrent	Subsequent
Democrats				
Thomas Martin (Virginia)	1911–13	X	X	
	1917–19	X		
John Kern (Indiana)	1913–17		X	
Oscar Underwood (Alabama)	1920–23	X		
Joseph Robinson (Arkansas)	1923–37	X		
Alben Barkley (Kentucky)	1937–49	X	X	
Scott Lucas (Illinois)	1949–51	X		
Ernest McFarland (Arizona)	1951–53			
Lyndon Johnson (Texas)	1953–61		X	
Michael Mansfield (Montana)	1961–77		X	
Robert C. Byrd (West Virginia)	1977–			
Republicans				
Shelby Cullom (Illinois)	1911–13	X	X	
Jacob Gallinger (New Hampshire).	1913–18	X	X	
Henry Cabot Lodge (Massachusetts).	1918–24	X	X	
Charles Curtis (Kansas)	1924–29	X	X	
James Watson (Indiana)	1929–33	X		
Charles McNary (Oregon)	1933–44	X		
Wallace White (Maine)	1945–49		X	
Kenneth Wherry (Nebraska)	1949–51			
Styles Bridges (New Hampshire)	1952–53	X		X
Robert Taft (Ohio)	1953	X		
William Knowland (California)	1953–59			
Everett Dirksen (Illinois)	1959–69			
Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania)	1969–77			
Howard Baker, Jr. (Tennessee)	1977–85			
Robert Dole (Kansas)	1985–	X		

[1] Table prepared by Robert A. Keith, research analyst, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Offices of the Leaders and Their Positions

The floor leaders of each party today are elected by a majority vote of all the Senators of the said party assembled in a conference or, as it sometimes is called, a caucus. The practice has been to choose the leader for a 2-year term at the beginning of each Congress. After the parties have held their elections, the selection is made known through the press or by announcement to the Senate. The majority and minority leaders are the elected spokesmen on the Senate floor for their respective political parties, having been elected by their fellow Senators of the same party, in caucus or conference, to whom they are responsible.[17]

The office is a political one, and was not created by the rules of the Senate even though the rules do confer certain powers on the leaders. Some provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Acts of 1946 and 1970, which were later incorporated into the Standing Rules of the Senate, as well as some other more recent amendments to the rules,[18] bestow certain unique authority on the majority and minority leaders. The standing rules now provide that standing committees (except the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget) may not meet while the Senate is in session, but the leaders, under the rules are authorized to grant such consent without action by the Senate. Rule XXVI reads in part: ". . . when the Senate is in session, no committee of the Senate or any subcommittee thereof may meet, without special leave, after the conclusion of the first two hours after the meeting of the Senate commenced and in no case after two o'clock postmeridian unless consent therefor has been obtained from the majority leader and the minority leader (or in the event of the absence of either of such leaders, from his designee). The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committees on Appropriations or the Committee on the Budget. The majority leader or his designee shall announce to the Senate whenever consent has been given under this subparagraph and shall state the time and place of such meeting. The right to make such announcement of consent shall have the same priority as the filing of a cloture motion." Under Rule XXV the leaders are authorized to increase the size of committees temporarily in order to accord to the majority party a majority of the membership of all standing committees. This provision of the rule is as follows: "By agreement entered into by the the majority leader and the minority leader, the membership of one

[17] Senator Barkley resigned as floor leader of the Democrats on February 24, 1944, growing out of a conflict with President Roosevelt over the veto of a revenue bill (H.R. 3687); he was immediately reelected by acclamation.

[18] See proceedings on S. Res. 274 and S. Res. 389, 96th Cong., Nov. 14, and Mar. 25, 1980, respectively.

or more standing committees may be increased temporarily from time to time by such number or numbers as may be required to accord to the majority party a majority of the membership of all standing committees. When any such temporary increase is necessary to accord to the majority party a majority of the membership of the standing committees, members of the majority party in such number as may be required for that purpose may serve as members of three standing committees listed in paragraph 2. No such temporary increase in the membership of any standing committee under this subparagraph shall be continued in effect after the need therefor has ended. No standing committee may be increased in membership under this subparagraph by more than two members in excess of the number prescribed for that committee by paragraph 2 or 3(a)."

Rule XVII provides that "Upon motion by both the majority leader or his designee and the minority leader or his designee, proposed legislation may be referred to two or more committees jointly or sequentially. Notice of such motion and the proposed legislation to which it relates shall be printed in the Congressional Record. The motion shall be privileged, but it shall not be in order until the Congressional Record in which the notice is printed has been available to Senators for at least twenty-four hours. No amendment to any such motion shall be in order except amendments to any instructions contained therein. Debate on any such motion, and all amendments thereto and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than two hours, the time to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees." Likewise, a "measure or matter reported from any standing committee may not be considered by the Senate unless the report upon any such measure or matter has been available to members of the Senate for at least two calendar days (excluding, Sundays and legal holidays)"; under the same rule, this requirement may be waived by joint agreement of the majority and minority leaders. The leaders are recognized by law in that funds are appropriated for the operation of their respective offices. Lastly, a resolution adopted on February 4, 1977 (S. Res. 4) provides that "The Committee on Rules and Administration, in consultation with the majority leader and the minority leader, shall review, on a continuing basis, the committee system of the Senate and the Standing Rules and other rules of the Senate related thereto." [19]

While in debate the leaders are generally recognized as the Senator from a said State and not as majority or minority leader, their colleagues, have acknowledged them as the leader of their respective parties and have extended to them this deference; they commonly

[19] **Senate Manual,** Senate Doc. 100–1, p. 154, Sec. 79.20.

refer to them in debate as the majority or minority leader as the case might be. Likewise, certain Government publications, including the *Congressional Directory* and the *Government Manual* as well as certain private publications, devote space to the offices of the majority and minority leaders, usually setting forth the staffs of their respective offices.

The relations between floor leaders and their respective party memberships revolve around an exchange basis. The members of the political party having consolidated their strength elect a leader and place this power at his disposal for operation of the legislative machine to carry out the party's program. The members of the party, in return for their support, can expect the leader's assistance in meeting their individual political needs insofar as practicable. The relationship is one of compromise and mutual forbearance in order to function as a body—a common characteristic of all popularly elected legislative institutions. The leaders are in a position to help any Senator of their party in most cases where the Senator would be unable to help himself acting alone. Individual Senators often consult the leadership about the following matters: when to participate in debate, committee assignments to be sought, particular appointments desired, the passage of particular pieces of legislation, the confirmation of particular nominations and desired administrative action by the executive branch, particularly when the President and the majority in control of Congress are of the same political party. In particular, the appointment powers of the two leaders gives them some leverage in working with the members of their respective parties.

The work of the leaders is highly significant in the functioning of party government in the Senate. The leader is the glue that holds his group together. Former President Lyndon Johnson, when majority leader in 1960, in an interview stated, however, that "the only real power available to the leader is the power of persuasion. There is no patronage; no power to discipline; no authority to fire Senators like a President can fire his members of Cabinet." [20] Continuing, he added, "A good leader should not only know more about the workings of the committee and how the members arrived at the content of the bill as finally recommended, but he must also know the problems of each individual State and the temperament of each individual Senator."

Under Rule XIX, the Presiding Officer of the Senate is directed to "recognize the Senator who shall first address him." By custom and practice, however, the Chair extends to the two leaders preferential recognition, with the majority leader having first consideration.

---

[20] *U.S. News & World Report*, June 27, 1960, p. 88.

As early as 1937, Vice President Garner, while presiding over the Senate, stated: "The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky because he is the leader on the Democratic side of the Chamber. He would recognize the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Austin), acting Republican leader, in the same way. When the Senator from Kentucky yielded to the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Nevada was on his feet. Had the Senator from Kentucky informed the Chair that he wanted the Senator from Nevada to be recognized as he was on his feet, the Chair would have recognized him." [21]

Since 1927 and 1937, the Democratic leader and the Republican leader, respectively, have continuously occupied the center aisle front row seats on the same side that their party members occupy. Senator Oscar W. Underwood was the first party leader to occupy one of these two seats, to which he was assigned from 1921 through 1923 while leader of the Democrats, but he then retained it until 1927 even while Senator Joseph T. Robinson was the Democratic leader. Seat assignments in the Senate are generally made according to seniority of service after a pattern giving the new members the back row seats farthest from the center aisle; then as members depart from the Senate the seats are reassigned always moving the more senior Senators downward toward the front row and nearer the center aisle. The two front row center aisle seats are now occupied by the majority and minority leaders with their respective assistant leaders occupying the seats next to them which places them closest and most directly in the line of vision of the presiding officer. Note the following table showing the Senators occupying the front row seats on either side of the center aisle from 1920 to date:

TABLE V.—*Chart showing the occupants of the two front row seats on either side of the center of the U.S. Senate from 1920 to date* [1]

Year	Republican side occupant	Democratic side occupant
1920–21	LaFollette	Chamberlain.
1921–23	LaFollette	Underwood.[2]
1923–25	LaFollette	Underwood.
1925–26	Cummins	Underwood.
1926–27	Phipps	Underwood.
1927–31	Phipps	Robinson.[2]
1931–33	Capper	Robinson.[2]
1933–36	Capper	Robinson.[3]
1937	McNary [2]	Robinson.[3]
1938–44	McNary [2]	Barkley.[3]

[21] *Cong. Rec.*, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8840.

TABLE V.—*Chart showing the occupants of the two front row seats on either side of the center of the U.S. Senate from 1920 to date* [1]—Continued

Year	Republican side occupant	Democratic side occupant
1945–46	White [2]	Barkley.[3]
1947–48	White [3]	Barkley.[2]
1949–50	Wherry [2]	Lucas.[3]
1951	Wherry [2]	McFarland.[3]
1952	Bridges [2]	McFarland.[3]
1953	Taft [3]	Johnson.[2]
1954	Knowland [3]	Johnson.[2]
1955–58	Knowland [2]	Johnson.[3]
1959–60 [4]	Dirksen [2]	Johnson.[3]
1961–69	Dirksen [2]	Mansfield.[3]
1969–77	Scott [2]	Mansfield.[3]
1977–80	Baker [2]	Byrd of W. Va.[3]
1981–85	Baker [3]	Byrd of W. Va.[2]
1985–87	Dole [3]	Byrd of W. Va.[2]
1987–	Dole [2]	Byrd of W. Va.[3]

[1] **Congressional Directory** is the source of the above information.
[2] Minority leader.
[3] Majority leader.
[4] On Jan. 6, 1960, the Republican Conference confirmed that the front row center aisle seat on the Republican side was to be occupied by the Republican leader.

Under the practices of the Democratic caucus, its leader is ex-officio chairman of all the party's policy making and organizational bodies—that is, the Democratic Conference, the Policy Committee, and the Steering Committee.

The Chairman of the Democratic Conference presides over that group which is composed of all the Democrats assembled. The Policy Committee, having been established by law, was created for the purpose of formulating "over-all legislative policy" for its political party. Each Policy Committee is provided with a staff "to assist in [its] study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determination," which is to be appointed by the policy Committee concerned.[22] Designated members of the Democratic Policy Committee also serve as members of its Legislative Review Committee. The Democratic Steering Committee serves as a Committee on Committees designating Democratic members to the legislative committees of the Senate, and this slate is approved subsequently by the Senate. Members of the Democratic Steering Committee are appointed by

[22] 60 Stat. 911.

the floor leader (who is also its ex-officio chairman), subject to confirmation by the conference. In making these appointments the floor leader is directed by the conference to give due regard to balance in the representation of the various ideological views within the party as well as the geographic areas from which its membership in the Senate is derived.

Under the practices of the Republican Conference, the Republican leader is not ex-officio chairman of all like policymaking and organizational bodies of his party. The conference rules of his party only desigate him as an ex-officio member of the Republican Policy Committee. His role as Republican leader, however, places him in a position to carry out essential functions in behalf of his party. Both leaders play roles that make them the central figure of their party when their party is in control.

Role of Leaders in the Senate

The floor leaders, once elected are confronted with the task of directing to enactment a legislative program. No two leaders approach the problem identically. A new majority leader more than likely will have certain new ideas as to how he can best conduct the Senate's business and will accordingly try out some new approaches to such an end. For example, when Mr. Byrd of West Virginia became the new majority leader, at the beginning of the 95th Congress (1977), he pursued some new procedures (1) to get the legislative program underway, and (2) to expedite the passage of non-controversial legislation.

In an effort to get the legislative program for the first session of the 95th Congress underway, following the adoption by the Senate of a resolution to reorganize the Senate Committee system, he directed the Senate to a schedule of not meeting any more often than was necessary to conduct its business. Likewise, the hour of convening the Senate was changed from time to time. In the first 4 months of Mr. Byrd's leadership, the Senate was convened less than one-third of the time before the noon hour—the regular meeting hour—and more than two-thirds of the time, the Senate met at noon or later; on several occasions, the Senate was convened as late as 4 p.m. During that period, the leader had the Senate to recess or to adjourn over approximately one-fourth of its working days. This changing of the time for the convening hour and recessing or adjourning over working days was implemented in an effort to allow the committees as much time as possible to consider proposed legislation pending before them, since the standing committees require permission to meet while the Senate is in session after a specified time each day following the convening of a daily session of the Senate. This plan was conceived to assure committees sufficient time to study and pre-

pare reports on measures and to get them placed on the Calendar of Business ready for Senate consideration.

The majority leader (Senator Byrd), regardless of the time of day the Senate convened, managed successfully to schedule most roll call votes at an hour in the afternoon so as not to interrupt meetings of committees which had been authorized to meet during the time the Senate was sitting. To save the time of the Senate he was also able to reduce the number of roll call votes as compared to the number during all recent prior Congresses. Mr. Byrd introduced another innovation in Senate operations at the beginning of his leadership, namely: on different occasions during the 95th Congress, he called together the chief counsels and staff directors of all the committees to work out schedules of committee meetings and markup sessions in an effort to avoid conflicts of such meetings as well as to expedite the preparation of proposed legislation. To save the time of the Senate, as majority leader, he regularly recessed from day to day instead of adjourning during the first session of the 95th Congress; this eliminated the routine morning business and the business of the morning hour after an adjournment which runs for 2 hours, except to the extent that time is granted by the consent of the Senate for the transaction of such business.

In an effort to expedite the passage of noncontroversial legislation, Senator Byrd, as a new majority leader, tried a new technique to get such bills passed after an orderly fashion with plenty of scrutiny. He requested and the Senate adopted an order on March 10, 1977, to create for the duration of the first session of the 95th Congress a "Unanimous Consent Calendar" on which would be placed "Measures Cleared to be Considered by Unanimous Consent." The order was obtained only for one session to give this procedure a test run; afterward it was abandoned.

The idea was to overcome a common practice of previous years. Instead of calling up and passing noncontroversial measures on the first day after they had been reported, such bills and resolutions, as soon as they had been reported and cleared "by both sides of the aisle" for passage by unanimous consent, were also to be placed for at least another day on the "Unanimous Consent Calendar," found at another page of the Calendar of Business. All Senators were then able to see at one place, all measures proposed to be passed by unanimous consent procedure.

Because of an increasing press of obligations on Senators to be in their home states, Senator Byrd adopted the practice in 1987 of scheduling debate and votes on important matters so that none occurred on Mondays (or sometimes Fridays). This longer "weekend" gave Senators greater ability to meet their obligations at home while not missing important votes; and it gave the leadership greater assur-

ance that their members could be present to transact necessary business in a predictable manner.

In 1988, Senator Byrd adopted the practice of operating, when possible, on a schedule of three weeks in session and one week out, to give Senators greater predictability in planning visits to their respective states or meeting whatever obligations they might have.

When Senator Baker of Tennessee assumed the majority leadership, with a new administration, he decided to make no effort to amend the standing rules of the Senate during the first part of the new Congress; he felt that changes in the rules of the last several years were major and should be allowed a chance for a test of their effectiveness. Besides, he wished instead to focus on issues of economic policy.

Senator Baker, however, wished to regularize floor procedures as far as possible which did not require changes in the standing rules. He, therefore, announced that when there was business to be transacted, the Senate would convene its sessions at approximately 11:00 a.m. and recess or adjourn at approximately 6:00 p.m., with Thursday nights left open for late night session when necessary—of course, he added that adjustment might be necessary regardless of his intention. The new majority leader on the opening day of the 97th Congress did propose that the Senate proceedings be televised; he introduced a resolution to that effect and appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration at a later date to testify in support of his resolution.

The minority leader, Senator Byrd, also favored televising the Senate's Chamber proceedings, and the two leaders worked together to overcome misgivings within their respective parties, leading to the eventual live gavel-to-gavel radio and television broadcast from the Senate floor, although the first broadcast was not accomplished until 1986, after Senator Baker had left the Senate.

In the 99th Congress, Senator Byrd, for himself and others, submitted S. Res. 28, which was reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration on November 19, 1985. After extensive consideration, the bill was returned to committee for amendment, and reported again on February 20, 1986, by Senator Dole, then majority leader. On February 27, the Senate adopted S. Res. 28, establishing a trial period for the live broadcast. Radio broadcast was begun on March 12, closed-circuit television on May 1, and on June 2, 1986, the first live broadcast of the Senate's proceedings was beamed to the public.

Pursuant to the resolution, the trial period ended on July 15, and on July 29, the question was put to the Senate, "Shall radio and television coverage continue after this date, and shall the rules changes contained herein continue?" The question was decided in the affirm-

ative establishing continuously the live broadcast of Senate proceedings to the public.

Senator Baker as majority leader continued the practice of recessing the Senate from day to day as opposed to adjourning—this saves time that would otherwise be consumed by morning hour proceedings. At the beginning of the 97th Congress he established for the first early months of the session not to meet on Mondays and Wednesdays so as to allow time to get his party organization established and to permit the standing committees time to get organized and prepare proposed legislation for reporting to the Senate, as well as to consider nominations for Senate action, without their continued interferences by floor activities.

Senator Dole, the new majority leader for the 99th Congress, was formerly chairman of the Finance Committee, after having been the ranking minority member for years, and as such had not served as an assistant party leader of the Senate, but he had been a Senator for sixteen years, playing an important role in his party during those years, and was his party's Vice Presidential candidate for the 1977–81 term. As chairman of the Finance Committee for four years, and a prominent member of the Committee on Agriculture for years, he had naturally concerned himself with the management of revenue, finance, and agricultural bills to their passage by the Senate, but he had not been directly exposed to the problem of enacting the overall annual legislative program of the Senate.

Thus, not having served as a party leader of the Senate, Senator Dole concluded that instead of trying out some new procedures immediately, he would utilize selected established processes until he had more time to examine and study the existing procedures and possible changes in them before proposing a new or different approach to expedite the enacting of the best possible legislative program.

Senate Dole emphasized his desire to work with the minority leader, other leaders of both parties, and the chairmen of Senate committees to get their support and their best possible cooperation in determining the day-to-day operations of the Senate to the enactment of the legislative program.

Resuming the role of majority leader in the 100th Congress, Senator Byrd has continued the effort to assist Senators in the difficulty of balancing their home state obligations with those of the Senate. To balance non-legislative periods (such as Mondays or Fridays when no session is held or no votes are recorded) he has employed the leader's prerogative of calling for a quorum soon after the Senate's appointed meeting hour. If no quorum is obtained, the leader enters a motion to instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to compel the presence of absent Senators and acquires a roll call vote thereon, creating a pow-

erful motivation for Senators to assure that they are on hand to proceed with the Senate's work.

The Senate's custom for several years has been to adopt a unanimous consent agreement at the beginning of each Congress limiting roll call votes to 15 minutes in length. But that order normally was not enforced, and in recent years it was not uncommon for the time required to complete a vote to stretch to 30 minutes or more. In the 100th Congress, the majority leader, Senator Byrd, has insisted that the order be complied with unless an order is adopted to allow a particular roll call vote to run longer.

The position of the floor leader is not that of an army general over a multitude of soldiers. Unlike army officers, the floor leaders must maintain continued support. They are subject to periodic re-election by the same persons they have been leading.

The role of the respective party leaders is an integral part of the effective functioning of the machinery of the Senate. The leader must keep himself briefed and informed on national and international problems in addition to pending legislative matters. On the floor of the Senate he is charged by his party members to deal with all procedural questions in consultation with them and his party's policymaking bodies. In turn, he must keep his membership currently advised as to proposed action on pending measures.

The leaders are in positions to act as clearing houses for their respective party memberships as to the status of pending legislation; the majority leader commonly posts the Senate on such matters. They work with the agents of their party to secure cooperation and unity in carrying out the party's legislative program. The majority leader remains in constant touch with the chairmen of the various standing committees to keep posted on the progress of legislation. Meetings are regularly held between the leaders and Senators to resolve or clear out any conflicts which might arise over or because of pending proposed legislation.

The majority and minority floor leaders, in cooperation with their respective party organizations, manage the legislative program. After informal consultation with Senators concerned, the majority leader proceeds to dispose of nearly all non-controversial business under unanimous consent procedure. Many controversial measures at the request of the majority leader are also called up for consideration under unanimous consent procedure even though such measures after being brought up are subject to entail a great deal of debate as well as action on many amendments thereto before they are finally passed.[23]

---

[23] The unanimous consent procedure expedites business on the floor but it is always subject to blockage by a single member of the Senate. The membership usually follows the majority leader in his procedural program; occasionally, however, a Senator deems his own position more important and objects.

All bills and resolutions, under the Call of the Calendar procedure, managed and directed by the majority leader, are disposed of after little or no debate and "without objection." While any Senator, independent of party organization, is free to prevent passage of bills under this procedure, objection is seldom heard. Members recognize that the leadership watches this type of legislation very closely in order to protect each individual Senator's concerns even in his absence from the floor.

Not infrequently agreements between the two leaders as to the disposition of business or particular procedure act to bar action on specific bills on a certain day. While the leaders do not in any sense rule by arbitrary edicts, the membership usually gives them deference in these instances.

The majority leader, or someone designated by him, remains continuously on the floor during each day of the session of the Senate to see that the program is carried out to the party's satisfaction. The minority leader or someone designated by him is always present on the floor to protect the rights of the minority. If, at any time, it appears necessary to take some unexpected noncontroversial action, the majority leader, or someone acting for him, with the approval of other "key" Senators, in the absence of opposition, will quickly alter his planned program and act on other business.

In more recent years the floor leader, in consultation with the policy committee, has had preponderant responsibility regarding the scheduling of legislation. Rarely is a conference of the whole party membership called for the determination of a detailed program. In earlier years, even in the 20th century, chairmen of committees usually submitted motions to proceed to the consideration of bills reported by their own committee. At the present time, however, nearly all such motions are made by the leader himself or someone designated by him. This includes requests for orders for the call of the calendar. The floor leaders work with the chairmen of the standing committees in order to keep legislation before the Senate as it is needed, and in order to expedite the legislative program for the year.

The leaders' part in debate is often designed to bring about passage or defeat of a legislative proposal according to party positions. Their speeches, therefore, recommending the passage or defeat of a measure are not necessarily confined to the substance of a bill. There are included, on occasions, reminders [24] of the needs of the party and of party loyalty.

---

[24] An extreme partisan statement by Mr. Underwood of Alabama when he was leader of the Senate and when the Senate was considering passage of the Panama bill in the 63rd Congress, might be noted in this connection.

"I have served from one Democratic Administration to another. I have never scratched a party ticket: I have always endeavored to live up to and sustain my party's platform. * * * The Democratic Party, not I, wrote this provision as to free tolls in its platform. I believe this plank of the platform is right. * * * Believing it is right, there is but one position that I can take, and that is to sustain the position of my party as expressed in its convention and in its platform."

The position the leaders take on pending legislation to carry out the will of their party may work adversely for them as individual Senators. The leaders are Senators of States and the latters' interests may not always coincide with the position of the national political party. Leaders vary in the way they reconcile this conflict. Nevertheless, there is inevitably some constraint to accommodate the President and Administration, particularly when they are of his party.

Senate leaders seek the highest possible degree of unified party action by holding numerous party conferences to reach agreement among members. The approach of each leader to this basic objective varies, however, with his personal characteristics and his political approach. Effective leaders can never lose sight of each Senator's claim to recognition in his own right, because he is not only a member of a party, he is also and foremost an "independent" constitutional entity whose authority is derived from his constituency.

The leaders, since the creation of the position, have always offered at least one of various technical motions relative to the organization of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress. These motions include (*a*) informing the House of Representatives that the Senate is in session and ready to do business; (*b*) informing the President of the United States that the Senate is in session with a quorum and ready to transact business; (*c*) setting the usual hour of daily meeting of the Senate; and (*d*) the election of the President pro tempore when such an official has to be elected or re-elected. A table giving some case histories of this practice since the turn of the 20th century can be found in Senate document 99–3, pp. 24–25.

In addition to the above organizational motions offered at the beginning of a new Congress, the responsibility for making motions essential to the day-to-day operation of the Senate has devolved upon the leadership. For example, the majority leader or someone acting for him almost invariably (*a*) offers motions to recess or adjourn from day to day; (*b*) calls up the *sine die* adjournment resolution and other resolutions relating to adjournment including resolutions and motions to adjourn for periods of several days; (*c*) makes motions to proceed to the consideration of all proposed legislation (bills and resolutions); and (*d*) proffers routine requests to accommodate the Senate, including orders to permit standing committees to meet while the Senate is in session, notwithstanding the provisions of the rule. While under the rules a quorum call is always in order at the suggestion of any Senator, the majority and minority leaders acting

together exercise influence in determining when such calls are to be requested as well as when issues will be voted on by yea and nay vote.

Through the years the majority leader has made the motions to recess or adjourn from day to day until it is now assumed to be virtually his prerogative. In recent years either the majority leader or somebody designated by him almost without exception has made such motions. That does not mean, however, that the majority leader does not frequently consult with the minority leader. On the contrary, they are invariably in daily consultation about various and sundry matters.

The decision as to when a *sine die* adjournment resolution shall be submitted is dependent upon many factors. The Senate leadership always consults with the President of the United States to see if he has further legislative requests to be considered. The leadership must work closely with the committee chairmen in their efforts to bring a session to a close and with the House of Representatives to determine the day for *sine die* adjournment. In short, the joint leadership plays a very significant role in determining the duration of a session, and, in the end, it is always left to the majority leader, or someone designated by him, to submit and call up the resolution for *sine die* adjournment.[25]

In recent years there has been a close personal working relationship between the two leaders. The majority leader keeps in close touch with the minority leader as to proposed legislation to be brought up, the procedure to be followed, and the legislative contests to be staged. By so doing the programming of legislation has become known to all concerned and the overall operation of the Senate has become a responsibility shared, in part, by the minority leader. This constant consultation between the respective leaders on all matters pertaining to Senate business has prevented misunder-

---

[25] The leaders are also in charge of seeing when and what resolutions relative to *sine die* adjournment are to be called up and agreed to, for example: resolutions informing the President of the United States that Congress is ready to adjourn, resolutions congratulating the President of the Senate and President pro tempore for the manner in which they presided over the Senate during the year, and resolutions to authorize the Vice President or President pro tempore to sign duly enrolled bills, and to make certain authorized appointments during adjournments.

In the case of a 3-day adjournment or an adjournment for a longer period of time with the consent of the House, the leader is responsible either for making such a motion or submitting such a resolution for accomplishing that end, but he must also take many factors into consideration before taking such action. He must be aware of any legislation needing immediate enactment, how far along the Senate is in enacting its legislative program for the year, and the sentiments of the other members of the Senate.

In the case of adjournment for several days, it falls upon the leader to insure that necessary orders are obtained in advance—including orders to authorize the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the President of the United States or the House of Representatives, or to authorize the appropriate presiding officer of the Senate to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment.

standing, conserved the time of individual Senators, and minimized procedural snags and wrangling.

Certain situations require special cooperation between the two leaders. For example, the beginning of a new Congress usually brings some shift of power, which must be reflected in personnel changes in committees, and in new committee ratios. Guided by requests for membership by their respective colleagues, the leaders may reach an agreement to recommend to their respective conferences and ultimately to the Senate a decrease or increase in the total size of a committee, or simply to change the party ratio.

Since the 1940's, the President has been holding special or weekly conferences with the leaders of both parties. When the floor leaders and the President are of the same political party, the former inevitably serve as leading legislative spokesmen for the Administration. Under recent practices, the President meets regularly with the floor leaders and others of the leadership of both Houses to sound them out and to get information on the possibilities of a legislative program. This procedure is used on occasion even when the President and the majority of Congress are of a different political inclination.

The President may follow such White House conferences with legislative recommendations in a message to the Congress. When such proposals are made, he depends on the support of the leaders at least to insure their full consideration.

Contacts and approaches between the President and the leadership are not limited to such formal conferences; they also include use of a body of full-time personal emissaries of the White House which is headed by the "Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations."

The leaders invariably are designated to receive and escort the President when he visits the Capitol—whether it be at a formal joint session for a State of the Union address or an informal reception. On state occasions and matters of national importance the majority and minority leaders perform comparable duties in unison.

In addition to the regular role of the majority and minority leaders, currently they also serve as *ex officio* members of the Select Commitee on Intelligence; both are members of, and traditionally Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively, of the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the United States Senate; and in recent Congresses the two leaders have been members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and are required by Senate Resolution 4, 95th Congress, to make, in conjunction with the Committee, a continuing study of the Senate committee system and other rules of the Senate.

GPO: 1985 (83-719 (f4101)